UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/887,492	06/22/2001	Luis M. Ortiz	ORTIZ-1001	7719

7590 04/22/2005

KERMIT D. LOPEZ/LUIS M. ORTIZ
ORTIZ & LOPEZ, PLLC, PATENT ATTORNEYS
P.O. BOX 4484
ALBUQUERQUE, NM 87196-4484

EXAMINER	
ELAHEE, MD S	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2645	

DATE MAILED: 04/22/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/887,492	LUIS M. ORTIZ	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Md S Elahee	2645	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE *03* MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *11/18/04*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-4,7-24,30,31,79-82,88-94,97-102,104 and 105* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-4,7-24,30,31,79-82,88-94,97-102,104 and 105* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

1. This action is responsive to an amendment filed 11/18/04. Claims 1-4, 7-24, 30, 31, 79-82, 88-94, 97-102, 104 and 105 are pending. Claims 5, 6, 25-29, 83-87, 95, 96 and 103 have been cancelled.

Response to Arguments

2. Applicant's arguments filed 11/28/04 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Regarding claim 1, the applicant agrees that 'Eldridge et al, in contrast to Applicant, does not identify the DRD to a network prior to rendering data' in page 15, lines 11 and 12. Therefore, a new ground of rejection in view of Eldridge and Cromer is applied below.

Regarding claims 15 and 30, the applicant further argues, none of teachings of the references in combination teach or suggest 'methods of finding a DRD using wireless device network resources and delivering data to be rendered at a DRD via networks at the request of a WD' in page 18, lines 17-20. Examiner again disagrees with the argument. Eldridge teaches methods of finding a DRD using wireless device network resources and delivering data to be rendered at a DRD via networks at the request of a WD (see col.col.2, lines 1-10, col.7, lines 55-62, col.9, lines 35-45, 61-67, col.10, lines 1-6). Therefore, the rejection of the claims in view of Eldridge will remain.

Claim Objections

3. Claim 97 is objected to because of the following informalities: regarding claim 97, the phrase 'claim 95' in page 9, line 1 of the claim appears to be 'claim 1'. Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 1-4, 6-9, 13, 15-20, 22-24, 30, 31, 79, 80, 82, 89-93, 98-102, 104 and 105 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Eldridge et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,515,988) in view of Cromer et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,493,104).

Regarding claim 1, Eldridge teaches selecting document (i.e., data) from a portable device (PDA) (i.e., wireless device (WD)) for rendering (abstract; fig.5, 7; col.8, lines 62-67, col.9, lines 1-12, 24-33, 61-67, col.10, lines 1-6).

Eldridge further teaches selecting a printer (i.e., DRD) not assigned to the PDA and located in a fixed location accessible by a PDA user to render the document (abstract; col.7, lines 44-54, col.9, lines 35-45, 61-67, col.10, lines 1-6).

Eldridge further teaches transferring the document to the printer (i.e., DRD) following specific action parameters (i.e., commands entered) by the PDA (i.e., WD) user at the PDA wherein the network supporting the PDA facilitates transfer of the data from electronic

repository (i.e., memory) associated with the PDA to the printer through the network supporting the PDA and the network supporting the printer (abstract; fig.5, 7; col.1, lines 29-35, col.7, lines 55-62, col.9, lines 35-45, 61-67, col.10, lines 1-6).

However, Eldridge does not specifically teach transferring the data only after the WD user identifies the DRD to a network supporting the WD. Cromer teaches that transferring the data only after the WD user identifies the DRD to a network supporting the WD (fig.3; col.5, lines 50-58). Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Eldridge to transfer the data only after the WD user identifies the DRD to a network supporting the WD as taught by Cromer. The motivation for the modification is to have doing so in order to make a direct data communication between the PDA and the printer.

Regarding claim 2, Eldridge teaches that the printer (i.e., DRD) renders document after a render command is provided to the printer (i.e., DRD) by the PDA user (col.9, lines 35-45, 61-67, col.10, lines 1-6).

Regarding claims 3, 86 and 93, Eldridge teaches that the render parameter (i.e., command) includes a service identifier (i.e., passcode) (col.7, lines 17-25, 55-61).

Regarding claim 4, Eldridge teaches rendering of the document by the printer (i.e., DRD) is controlled by the PDA (i.e., WD) (col.7, lines 55-62, col.9, lines 35-45, 61-67, col.10, lines 1-6).

Regarding claim 7, Eldridge teaches that data is rendered by the DRD after the render command is provided by the WD user to the DRD (col.9, lines 35-45, 61-67, col.10, lines 1-6).

Regarding claim 8, Eldridge teaches that the data is retrieved from an electronic repository (i.e., mailbox) assigned to the WD user only after the WD user provides a passcode to the DRD, and wherein the DRD renders the data after the data is delivered to the DRD (col.9, lines 16-34).

Regarding claim 9, Eldridge teaches that the passcode is provided to the DRD by the WD (col.7, lines 44-54).

Regarding claim 13 is rejected for the same reasons as discussed above with respect to claim 1. Furthermore, Eldridge fails to teach the network providing the WD with location information for at least one DRD not assigned to the WD and located in a fixed location accessible by the WD user to render the data. Cromer teaches sending that the network providing the WD with location information for at least one DRD not assigned to the WD and located in a fixed location accessible by the WD user to render the data (abstract; fig.3; col.5, lines 31-34, 50-58). Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Eldridge to allow the network providing the WD with location information for at least one DRD not assigned to the WD and located in a fixed location accessible by the WD user to render the data as taught by Cromer. The motivation for the modification is to have doing so in order to make a selection of the printer to print document.

Regarding claim 15 is rejected for the same reasons as discussed above with respect to claim 1. Furthermore, it is not clear whether Eldridge teaches entering a DRD locator request with a network supporting the WD to find at least one DRD located near the WD. Cromer teaches sending a query signal (i.e., entering a DRD locator request) to find at least one DRD located near the WD (abstract; fig.3; col.5, lines 31-34, 50-58). Thus, it would have been

obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Eldridge to allow entering a DRD locator request with a network supporting the WD to find at least one DRD located near the WD as taught by Cromer. The motivation for the modification is to have doing so in order to make a direct data communication between the PDA and the printer.

Eldridge further does not specifically teach receiving location information at the WD for the at least one DRD located near the WD and accessible to the WD user. Cromer teaches receiving location information at the WD for the at least one DRD located near the WD and accessible to the WD user (abstract; fig.3; col.5, lines 31-34, 50-58). Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Eldridge to allow receiving location information at the WD for the at least one DRD located near the WD and accessible to the WD user as taught by Cromer. The motivation for the modification is to have doing so in order to make a selection of a printer.

Regarding claims 16, 17, 28 and 29 are rejected for the same reasons as discussed above with respect to claim 6.

Regarding claims 18-20 are rejected for the same reasons as discussed above with respect to claims 7-9 simultaneously.

Regarding claims 22-24 are rejected for the same reasons as discussed above with respect to claims 2-4 simultaneously.

Regarding claim 30 is rejected for the same reasons as discussed above with respect to claim 1. Furthermore, Eldridge teaches requesting support from a network supporting the PDA (i.e., WD) to assist the user in locating at least one printer (i.e., data rendering device (DRD)) not assigned to the PDA and accessible to the user of the PDA, the locating executed by the network

following at least one of commands by the user (abstract; col.7, lines 44-54, col.9, lines 35-45, 61-67, col.10, lines 1-6).

Regarding claim 31, Eldridge teaches that the PDA (i.e., WD) renders data to the printer (i.e., DRD) after a render command is provided by the user associated with the WD (col.9, lines 35-45, 61-67, col.10, lines 1-6).

Regarding claim 79, Eldridge teaches receiving a request for the WD at a network supporting the WD to locate at least one printer (i.e., DRD) in accordance with a WD user profile associated with the WD (col.7, lines 44-54, col.9, lines 35-45, 61-67, col.10, lines 1-6).

Eldridge further teaches locating at least one printer (i.e., DRD) matching the WD user profile (col.9, lines 35-45, 61-67, col.10, lines 1-6).

Eldridge further teaches identifying at least one printer (i.e., DRD) matching the WD user profile to the WD in response to the request (col.9, lines 35-45, 61-67, col.10, lines 1-6).

Regarding claim 80, Eldridge teaches that the WD user profile consists of WD location information (col.7, lines 44-54).

Regarding claim 82, Eldridge teaches that the WD user profile includes user destination information (col.7, lines 44-54).

Regarding claims 83, 91 and 92, Eldridge teaches that the data is received at the DRD via a communications network following the commands entered by the WD user at the WD, and the step of providing the data to the DRD is initiated at the WD and process through a wireless network supporting the WD (col.9, lines 35-45, 61-67, col.10, lines 1-6).

Regarding claim 85, Eldridge teaches that the step of rendering the data at the DRD follows a rendering command received at the DRD by the WD (col.9, lines 35-45, 61-67, col.10, lines 1-6).

Regarding claim 89, Eldridge teaches receiving at a workstation (i.e., network server) a request associated with the WD for delivery of the data for rendering at the printer (i.e., DRD) (col.7, lines 44-54, col.9, lines 35-45, 61-67, col.10, lines 1-6).

Eldridge further teaches determining if delivery of data can be approved by at least one of the network and/or DRD (col.9, lines 35-45, 61-67, col.10, lines 1-6).

Eldridge further teaches if delivery is approved, the server processes the request including facilitating delivery of the data to the DRD (col.9, lines 35-45, 61-67, col.10, lines 1-6).

Regarding claim 90, Eldridge teaches receiving the data from the server at the DRD (col.9, lines 35-45).

Regarding claims 98, 101, 102 and 105, Eldridge teaches that the command enable WD user manipulation of data during rendering of the data at the DRD using the WD (col.9, lines 35-45, 61-67, col.10, lines 1-6).

Regarding claims 99 and 104, Eldridge teaches that the DRD is at least a copier (i.e., photocopier) (abstract; col.5, lines 29-31).

Regarding claim 100 is rejected for the same reasons as discussed above with respect to claims 1 and 99.

6. Claims 10 and 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Eldridge et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,515,988) in view of Cromer et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,493,104) further in view of Challener et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,591,297).

Regarding claims 10 and 21, Eldridge in view of Cromer fails to teach "said passcode is provided at a user interface located within said DRD". Challener teaches that the passcode is provided at an entry pad (i.e., user interface) located within the printer (i.e., DRD) (fig.1; col.3, lines 16-18). Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Eldridge in view of Cromer to allow the passcode being provided at a user interface located within the DRD as taught by Challener. The motivation for the modification is to have doing so in order to store the location information in the memory.

7. Claims 11, 88, 94 and 97 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Eldridge et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,515,988) in view of Cromer et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,493,104) further in view of Magro et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,457,078).

Regarding claims 11, 88, 94 and 97, Eldridge in view of Cromer fails to teach "said rendering command includes decryption coding". Magro teaches that the rendering command includes decryption coding (abstract; col.3, lines 35-49, col.4, lines 16-24, 31-54). Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Eldridge in view of Cromer to allow the rendering command including decryption coding as taught by Magro. The motivation for the modification is to have doing so in order to decode the control command associated with token.

8. Claim 12 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Eldridge et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,515,988) in view of Cromer et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,493,104) further in view of Borza (U.S. Patent No. 6,076,167).

Regarding claim 12, Eldridge in view of Cromer fails to teach "said passcode includes at least one biometric". Borza teaches that the passcode includes at least one biometric (col.8, lines

65-67). Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Eldridge in view of Cromer to allow passcode including at least one biometric as taught by Borza. The motivation for the modification is to have doing so in order to provide reduce the information transmitted to the server to a subset of the biometric information.

9. Claim 14 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Eldridge et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,515,988) in view of Cromer et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,493,104) further in view of Ronen (U.S. Pub. No. 2002/0156708).

Regarding claim 14, Eldridge in view of Cromer fails to teach "said network further provides WD with a passcode for use at said DRD to render the data as part of said commands". Ronen teaches that the network further provides WD with a password (i.e., passcode) for use at the DRD to render the data as part of said commands (page 3, paragraph 0029). Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Eldridge in view of Cromer to allow network further provides WD with a passcode for use at the DRD to render the data as part of said commands as taught by Ronen. The motivation for the modification is to have doing so in order to provide security for retrieval of data.

10. Claim 81 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Eldridge et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,515,988) in view of Cromer et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,493,104) further in view of Boyle et al. (International Pub. No. WO 00/77979 A2).

Regarding claim 81, Eldridge in view of Cromer fails to teach "said WD user profile includes DRD capability criteria". Boyle teaches that the WD user profile includes DRD

capability criteria (page 7, lines 7-10, page 12, lines 8-15). Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Eldridge in view of Cromer to allow the WD user profile including DRD capability criteria as taught by Boyle. The motivation for the modification is to have doing so in order to provide add to the subscriber based on the profile information.

Conclusion

11. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Nykanen et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,285,889) teach Information output system, method for outputting information and terminal devices for outputting information via mobile communication network and Jones et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,363,254) teach System and method for enciphering and communicating vehicle tracking information.

12. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Md S Elahee whose telephone number is (571) 272-7536. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon to Fri from 8:30am to 5:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Fan Tsang can be reached on (571) 272-7547. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

M. E.

MD SHAFIUL ALAM ELAHEE
April 18, 2005

FAN TSANG
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600